



APPROVED Minutes of the **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, February 17, 2015, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairman Grover, Members Gulatee, Hardnock, and Kennerley, Trustee Liaison McDonough.

ALSO PRESENT: Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Grover called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by Community & Economic Development Director McNellis and **Chairman Grover** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, January 20, 2015.

Member Gulatee moved and **Member Hardnock** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the special meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on January 20, 2015, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Preliminary Review of Site Design Concept & Townhome Designs for a proposed 102-unit Townhome PUD on Sedgebrook Lot 2 (Pulte Homes)

Steve McNellis, Director of Community and Economic Development, noted that Pulte Homes requested coming before the ARB in a workshop atmosphere to seek input on the conceptual site layout, including the street network, green space, and building layouts and designs, along with proposed color and material palette, located on the northerly 20 acres previously part of the Sedgebrook Retirement Campus along Milwaukee Avenue. He referenced the design review comments featured in Staff's memorandum dated February 17, 2015, which were forwarded by the Village Board and part of Staff's feedback. In particular, he noted attention and consideration should be directed to the appropriate density specifically as it relates to the green space, and the building and street layout. Secondly, is there adequate and usable green space, and further, is there an interesting street layout pattern. The variety of building facades, its compatibility and the appropriateness of the materials will also be discussed. Therefore, your feedback is important in order to be incorporated into the PUD Development Plans for consideration at a subsequent ARB meeting.



Mark Mastrococco, Director of Land Aquisition for Pulte Homes, Inc., expressed his appreciation to present the proposal for Camberley Club, as they have been seeking an opportunity for many years to develop a quality residential site in Lincolnshire with its strong sense of community, its proximity to major centers of employment, and access to highways, along with the various amenities offered within the Village, such as excellent schools, parks, shopping, and restaurants. He also introduced his project team who will be providing a power point presentation. **Mr. Mastrococco** assured Camberley Club will be an upscale, private, gated townhome community with 102 upscale townhomes for consumers looking for the lifestyle features the Village has to offer, as well as the unique integration of a path system which is walkable and bikeable to the various nearby amenities. The general framework of Pulte's vision for the property includes two townhome product series with one larger (2500-2650 s.f.) than the other (1700-2100 s.f.). They are targeting four different consumer groups: 1.) The surrounding corporate groups, 2.) young professionals, 3.) non-married households, and 4.) empty nesters. He feels Camberley Club will complement the other quality housing opportunities in the Village.

Charles Hanlon, Urban Principal Planner, with WBK Design, began the power point presentation showing the evolution of the site layout and noted one very interesting aspect of this project in terms of location is the nine-tenths of a mile walk to Lincolnshire Commons and CityPark which offers a variety of entertainment, shopping, and restaurants. Also, if the proposed trail system eventually connects the north and south areas on Milwaukee Avenue, it will extend the possibilities for a bike path, as well. The attribute of being able to walk or bike to these entities fits along with the buyer profile and lifestyle. He alluded to the surrounding developments with Rivershire to the north and Sedgebrook on the south end of the 20+ acre property, and pointed out the substantial vegetation and berming along Riverside Rd. and Milwaukee Avenue. The south and southeast edge of the site currently has very limited screening and an 8' tall fence is proposed which will be buffered on the residential side with additional landscaping. Also, the realignment of Riverside Road with Tower Parkway has been planned which will provide a signalized intersection for the site, cost of which would be borne by Pulte Homes and made part of the site improvements. With those items in place, it leaves a triangular area to the north which Pulte would be willing to dedicate to the Village. This will offer a trailhead respite spot where the regional trails can come together, and additionally, Pulte would be responsible for the development of this public site amenity along with Village approval and guidance as to the design. **Mr. Hanlon** explained that the site design evolved by using the screening on Riverside Road and Milwaukee Avenue to locate the rear yards of the townhomes to create a very private environment without looking onto the rear yard of another series of townhomes. By putting the buildings in front of the yards, the road placement takes place and this creates the overall geometry and framework of the design. As shown on the site layout, an opportunity for the largest open space, triangular in shape, with .6 acres is proposed to be used as a park with roads on all three sides to provide visibility and openness. Another open space area, likened to a passive sitting area or pocket park, has been proposed at the southern corner. Meandering sidewalks tied to the street layout provide the connections between these open



space areas. He noted that 80 townhome units back up to either the open space or screening buffers, which includes a defined 30' flat rear yard before the berms, as well as a distance of 80' between the rear of any buildings not adjacent to any berming, all of which translates into the spaciousness of this development. Further, he pointed out the privately maintained road system is within a 60' wide corridor which allows for utilities, etc. The design of the road shifts to one side or the other, in order to keep the driveways at a minimum of 22'-23' to the curb line to accommodate a longer pickup truck or Suburban.

Mr. Hanlon addressed Staff's concern for a curvilinear design to add interest versus the original linear site concept. He noted, from a design standpoint, everything he previously noted in the original site concept, ie. the rear yards are still placed along the buffers with the depth of 30 feet to create a private area, and likewise, the trailways remain linked throughout the development. With the 102 townhomes proposed, the orientation of some of the buildings have changed as to which road they face, but for the most part, the design similarities have remained with the exception of the feel of the roadway system with more of a curvilinear design than a linear design aspect. He pointed out Concept 2 is not as well detailed in design, but offers an opportunity for discussion with regard to the street layout.

Trustee Liaison McDonough questioned if the park space has been removed from Concept 2, to which **Mr. Hanlon** affirmed and responded that the open space has been redistributed. **Trustee Liaison McDonough** expressed concern for the street width and if there would be a Homeowner's Association responsible for the roads within the development. **Mr. Hanlon** explained, the width of the street is the standard 27' wide from curb to curb, which would allow for parking on one side with its placement focused on the side without the driveways in order to accommodate more parking. As the plan moves forward, the guest parking availability will be shown. In conjunction, the garage will provide two car spaces, as well as the driveway allowing for parking two cars. He affirmed there would be a Homeowner's Association which would maintain the site.

Member Kennerley questioned the purpose of the Concept 2, to which **Director McNellis** explained Staff's concern for a linear gridded block effect and the necessity for the large open space park as shown in Concept 1. Thus, the natural curvature of the street layout reduces the open space by redistributing smaller green spaces throughout the site.

Greg Sagen, President and Landscape Architect, with Signature Design Group, Inc. began his presentation noting the trailhead public triangular amenity at the northern tip of the site, which will serve as the gateway to the development, will be substantially landscaped, along with it bermed and buffered from Riverside Road. He envisions the park site anchored by a possible pavillion or shelter, with such amenities as a seat wall enclosure, brick pavers, drinking fountain element, bike parking area, and wayfinding signage. There is a landscaped median centered at the main entrance boulevard to the development, and the overall site landscaping will be ornate and extensive in order to provide the privacy expected within an upscale development. The fence and wall on the south side of Riverside drive, at



the entrance from Milwaukee Avenue, has been reworked according to Staff's input by consolidating the sign wall into the inner walls. (alludes to the masonry enclosure and entry sign wall sketch previously circulated).

Member Kennerley suggested lighting be incorporated for purposes of safety within the public trailhead area and along any interior pathways, and also to consider the addition of evergreens among the landscape plantings. **Mr. Sagen** assured these points of concern have been considered. He explained the various open space elements, and by nature of design, there is consideration for an open lawn area, a small playground element for children, and the railway system. In Concept 2, he pointed out the larger open space would be difficult to incorporate; however, this concept offers a much larger meandering trail system more casual in its design. With regard to both Concepts in terms of fencing, **Director McNellis** questioned if there is fencing within the site design other than the perimeter. **Mr. Sagen** noted that no internal fencing has been planned in either concept. However the perimeter units would be allowed to have fencing along their rear property lines. **Member Kennerley** expressed concern for the durability and maintenance of the 8' wood fence along the south side adjacent to the institutional development (Sedgebrook). Rather than the proposed wood fence, she suggested a more durable material be considered. **Mr. Sagen** noted a PVC material would be a possible alternative and noted there would be landscaping on the residential side of the fence as well. Also, the fence would be on HOA property and be maintained by same. With respect to the possible cost of said maintenance of a fence, **Member Kennerley** requested alternatives be considered, to which **Mr. Sagen** agreed. In concluding his presentation, **Mr. Sagen** noted the landscaping will be integrated with the architecture of the townhomes and the streetscape.

Mike Hausler, with Pulte Homes, provided an overview of the product consisting of "Villas" and "Terraces". He noted the materials used are stone, brick, siding, and architectural shingles, along with the front elevation feature of double garage doors and front entrances. The design features consisting of roof and gable lines along with window placement on the elevations add to the architectural interest. **Member Kennerley** suggested a contrast in the color palette of the earth tones. **Mr. Hausler** explained the "Terraces" product feature offer a side entrance with a first floor master bedroom as a buyer choice, as well as different roof lines than the "Villas" and a choice of covered front entries. The elevations offer brick, stone, shake or regular siding. **Mr. Mastrocchio** added both product designs offer a choice of first floor master bedrooms.

Member Gulatee noted the roof line on the Villas lacks architectural interest as compared to the Terraces. He suggested the addition of more design interest on the Villas, which in turn would give the homeowner a sense of individuality in the design of their particular townhome. **Member Kennerley** suggested a better contrast of the use of brick and stone, as it was difficult to differentiate the two material features on the elevations.

Chairman Grover expressed his preference for the larger open space for activities



in Concept 1, and the more natural flow of the street layout in Concept 2. From his perspective, he noted the interior space is more valuable than the benefit of the curvilinear roadway. **Member Gulatee** noted his preference for Concept 2 with regard to the natural street layout, but stated his concern for a few buildings which have front elevations facing rear elevations. **Member Kennerley** stated her preference for Concept 1, as the townhome layout provides a consistent decent view for all homeowners, whereas Concept 2 appears messy. Also, in providing the parks and/or open spaces, Concept 1 has a better sense of community and appears to be the better use of the land.

Trustee Liaison McDonough asked about a blend of the two concepts, in which there is less density, but the parks and green space from Concept 2 is utilized. **Member Kennerley** noted the roads don't have to be as drastic as in Concept 2, which creates chaos and bad views for residents within the development. **Member Gulatee** inquired if Pulte could come up with a concept where one of the multi-unit structures is taken out.

Member Hardnock agreed with a lot of the comments. He noted he leaned toward Concept 1, as he believes it is more functional, and he likes the triangular park. He noted he does not support pathways in what is perceived to be people's backyards, which is prevalent in Concept 1. He noted he likes the park and separation of spaces in Concept 1, but also likes the curvature and natural feel of Concept 2. He did believe some roads needed to be designed to better break up their length. Overall, however, he believes Concept 1 is the better of the two.

Mr. Hanlon noted a lot of units look into park space. He further stated they could change how intersections occur to help break up the length of roadways. His take on the ARB's discussion so far was that they leaned toward Concept 1, with some of the attributes of Concept 2.

Director McNellis noted the units along the road paralleling Milwaukee Avenue feel dense. The 'bumpout' along that road is not pronounced enough. He stated in a perfect world something happens to give that western road more interest. He further noted there should be consideration for having only six buildings along the Milwaukee Avenue frontage, with a larger green space in the middle of that run of buildings, which would tie into the park system in the development. By removing one building along that Milwaukee Avenue frontage, the plan seems to get a lot greener.

Trustee Liaison McDonough noted that Pulte's definition of open space differs from Lincolnshire's definition, especially in terms of square footage that Pulte considers open space.

Director McNellis agreed with Trustee McDonough and noted Lincolnshire has a lot of subdivisions where there are swaths of conserved natural land, especially north of Rt. 22. This area was conserved for a reason, for a purpose, and isn't just what's left over. Staff doesn't see a lot of green space in Concept 1, other than the triangle park. The rest of the so-called green space feels like remnant space.



Chairman Grover asked if Pulte could take another look at building layout and providing interest in the road layout, such as turns or jogs. He asked the ARB if it was the consensus that everyone strongly agrees with maintaining the triangular green open space in any concept. There was a consensus of the ARB affirming that position. **Chairman Grover** also noted the building in the most far southeast corner of the development should be pushed further south, with a road jog on the emergency access road out to Riverside Drive.

Trustee Liaison McDonough noted this is an isolated spot. It will be difficult for these residents to get to other Lincolnshire parks. The question the ARB should consider is do we need parks & recreation built into this development because it is so isolated? We should consider this now. **Chairman Grover** responded this is remote and he'd like to see more green space. **Mr. Hanlon** responded that he's not sure that putting in a backstop and a ball field in the triangular park makes the most sense, however. There would be enough space there to play pickup sports.

Director McNellis requested that for the next meeting Pulte show dimensions of the core pieces of green space and then overlay this on a plan of Whytegate Park to see how it compares. Trustee McDonough noted that in other areas we've done some things where the Village has credited nearby green space to a development, but those options really aren't available here.

Member Kennerley reiterated you have to have some sort of a park, as it represents a sense of community. **Mr. Hanlon** questioned Staff requesting centralized green space. Pulte believes in the idea of a strong green space at the entry with complimentary space at the southern end of the development.

Director McNellis summed up that it seemed as though the ARB is saying they find the most positive attributes in Concept 1, with the idea of revising the street layout somewhat and more green space, as well as more usable park space. **Trustee Liaison McDonough** noted he felt that what was taken away in Concept 2 does not represent a positive direction.

Trustee Liaison McDonough inquired as to whether or not Pulte had done anything more in communicating with the school districts. **Mr. Mastrorocco** stated they have spoken with the assistant Superintendents for the various Districts, who wanted to be kept updated on their progress. He further noted he would give the Superintendent's a call to follow-up and update them. He will make sure Pulte is answering any questions they have. He further noted they had reached out to Districts 102 and 103 and Stevenson. 103 was a meeting, the rest were done by phone, as those districts didn't feel a meeting was necessary.

Trustee Liaison McDonough inquired as to whether or not there could be a second point of ingress/egress for emergencies. **M. Hanlon** noted there are two access points from Riverside, however, if Trustee McDonough is talking about two from Milwaukee Avenue, **Mr. Hanlon** felt the boulevard entry off Milwaukee Avenue would allow traffic to get by on one side in the event of an accident right at that



intersection. When asked if the Plat had been reviewed by the Fire District, **Mr. Hanlon** stated it had been and their main concern was that there be two points of access off Riverside drive. **Director McNellis** stated that Pulte should still follow-up with Sedgebrook on a possible access point maybe at the southwest corner of their development, given this would be beneficial to both of you.

Chairman Grover directed the ARB to next provide commentary on the actual townhouse buildings themselves. His feeling was that overall, with regard to the Villas buildings, they need something to break-up the four-unit Building 3 rear façade. He suggested roofline changes could help.

Member Gulatee noted his concern about issues with snow in the front alcoves of the buildings. He inquired as to how this would work in this climate. **Mr. Mastrorocco** stated this design had been used in multiple Illinois communities without problems. **Member Gulatee** further stated he agreed with Staff's comments that there should be a simple common theme, but with enough interest and variations.

Director McNellis noted it would be helpful to show the building elevations with plantings at the time of planting and five years out, so it will demonstrate that greenery will help break-up the facades.

Member Hardnock drew Pulte's attention to the rear facades of the buildings and noted there is a lot of siding shown. He doesn't believe the designs show a truly 4-sided design, especially Villas Building 1. He felt they didn't look like distinct homes from the rear, rather they appeared to be one large building. Further, he noted you can't tell one unit from the other and there is a distinct lack of design interest. **Member Hardnock** noted that placing stone material above brick on the facades is a real problem, to which Member Gulatee and Director McNellis agreed. He felt it had a heavy feel and looked out of place. Finally, he noted that with so many materials and colors present, it was a little overwhelming.

Director McNellis stated that some of these concerns could be addressed by vary the façade undulation and roof line changes, along with a reduction in the palette of materials, to which member Hardnock agreed. **Mr. Hausler** noted that Pulte could eliminate some materials and colors.

Member Kennerley stated she felt the elevations are actually pretty bland, really the opposite of what Member Hardnock is saying. **Director McNellis** suggested that the base of the buildings on the sides and rear could have a water table that could be stone or brick and those materials would extend to the second floor only if it is a continuation up from the first floor. This base would tie the building to the ground, giving it a base, mid-section and cap. **Member Kennerley** further stated if you go too monotone, it's hard to distinguish the units. She likes the variety and feel it gives it a "city" look.

Mr. Mastrorocco stated Pulte would like to reflect as best as possible all the concerns. **Member Hardnock** did note one other comment, with regard to the brick



wall at the entry to the project development. He asked Pulte to consider adding some variety, perhaps considering revising the columns on the walls to be stone.

With those comments, **Chairman Grover** and the ARB requested Pulte revise their plans and return to the ARB for further review.

3.2 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING regarding text amendments to various sections of Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise and clarify requirements for permanent and temporary signs (Village of Lincolnshire).

Chairman Grover recessed the ARB meeting and reopened the public hearing.

Director McNellis summarized the staff report dated February 17, 2015. He stated at the January meeting the ARB agreed with staff-proposed changes. Multi-tenant wall signs were an item requiring additional research. Staff also revisited take-out parking signs and identified inconsistencies in the Awnings & Canopies section of the Sign Code. Director McNellis summarized the results of staff research regarding wall signs in multi-tenant office and office/warehouse buildings. He noted for multi-tenant office building wall signs, staff recommends one wall sign per frontage and that a decision regarding which business in that building gets a wall sign be left to the landlord. Staff does not believe we should allow wall signs for the largest business in terms of size or building area they occupy. He asked the ARB what separation between two signs on adjoining elevations they would like incorporate into the requirements. He said staff's memo proposes a 5' minimum separation between a sign and the edge of the building [clarification: the minimum separation was 10', not 5', from the edge of the building]. **Director McNellis** stated there are other ways to stipulate separation such as based on the length of the elevation on which the sign is displayed.

Member Hardnock stated he believes 5' separation is not sufficient and half frontage length of width should be considered.

Trustee Liaison McDonough expressed his agreement with staff's recommendation landlords need to decide which businesses should take signs.

Director McNellis noted for multi-tenant office/warehouse building wall signs, staff proposes allowing wall signs for those tenants who has a building entrance facing a street or a parking lot. Office/warehouse buildings are mostly located in Lincolnshire's Business Park, in the Bond/Heathrow area. The question staff has for the ARB is whether wall signs should be allowed over the entry, next to the entry or both? **Director McNellis** noted if the ARB likes both options, Staff recommends the first tenant placing a wall sign dictates future placement (for example, if the first tenant decided to place their wall sign over the entry, all other tenants will be required to have their signs placed over the entries too).



Member Hardnock noted the placement of wall signs will depend on the location of doors (there may be cases when two doors are located right next to each other), requiring a minimum separation between two adjoining signs.

Director McNellis stated staff will look into the separation and bring it back for the ARB's consideration at the next meeting.

Director McNellis noted as is the case with other code requirements, exceptions will be permitted by variance.

Director McNellis noted regarding take-out signs staff's proposal was to regulate take out parking signs for restaurants. Staff recommends no more than two take-out signs be allowed per restaurant. Currently, the code does not address these types of signs. Historically, restaurants have installed take-out signs at their own discretion, without a Village permit. The Cheesecake factory has three take-out parking signs, Big Bowl-4. Staff seeks the ARB's input whether three take-out signs should be permitted. This would mean The Cheesecake factory signs will be compliant with regard to their number and Big Bowl will have one sign too many. Big Bowl's sign will become legally non-conforming if they decide to keep it.

Chairman Grover sought clarification regarding the concern such unregulated signs present. He noted it appears this is not a big issue for standalone restaurants.

Director McNellis noted take-out signs oftentimes consume a big portion of required parking in multi-tenant shopping centers. Take-out signs are dedicated parking although no one enforced it.

Trustee Liaison McDonough stated he feels each restaurant needs to determine how many take-out signs they need based on their business needs.

Director McNellis said the Village parking code calculated overall parking requirements based on the number of seats, not take-out needs of a business. It would be difficult to make a uniform standard as some restaurants rely heavily on take-out business (e.g., pizza and sushi restaurants) and some do not. Some restaurants want to have a few take-out signs as part of their business. He stated if a restaurant has a big carry-out business, they will have the ability to make their case to the Village and request additional take-out parking signs over what the code permits.

Trustee Liaison McDonough suggested imposing a specific window for take-out restaurant signs (e.g., 4-7 p.m.). Outside that window, those signs would be available for regular parking.

Member Hardnock inquired about the time limit on existing take-out signs at CityPark.

Director McNellis stated staff will research the time limits and bring back that information to the March ARB meeting.



Director McNellis stated the ARB agreed with staff's recommendation to limit balloons to 5 displays per year. In speaking with the Village Attorney further regarding these items following the February ARB meeting, balloon signs need to be relocated to the Temporary Sign section from the Exempt section for the display limit to be imposed.

Director McNellis noted since the February ARB meeting staff has identified a number of inconsistencies in the Awnings/Canopies section of the Code. Staff would like to revisit this section and bring revisions to the March ARB meeting.

With no further comments from the ARB, the ARB decided to continue the Public Hearing regarding the Sign Code until the regularly scheduled March 17, 2015 ARB meeting to allow staff the opportunity to further address proposed code revisions.

- 3.3 CONTINUED Consideration and Discussion regarding text amendments to Chapter 2 of Title 13, Landscaping, of the Lincolnshire Village Code to revise and update the Village's landscaping requirements (Village of Lincolnshire).

Staff requested this agenda item be continued to a future ARB meeting to allow the appropriate staff to present Staff's findings and recommendations.

1.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

6.0 NEW BUSINESS

Director McNellis requested informal comments from the ARB regarding a proposed canopy for the proposed North Shore University medical facility in the current Barnes & Noble space at Lincolnshire Commons.

The ARB summarized their comments: Overall, the canopy design is acceptable, though some members felt it might be appropriate to "pre-patina" the copper to a certain color and then "arrest" it, so it remains that color over time. This was due to some concern over the color of the canopy as it ages, in relation to the building. There was agreement the letters on the wall signs should have a greater depth from the metal panel on which they are mounted. Overall, there was not a great appreciation for the unlit canopy sign, but no great outcry against it either. Finally, Member Gulatee requested information be provided regarding how the snow and water drainage would be handled from the canopy roof.

7.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Chairman Grover** requested an adjournment, to which **Member Hardnock** made a motion and **Member Kennerley** seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director.